1: Burrows--97 (1947-48) Woleaians 1-2
116, 613, 423 Ifalik

"On Ifalik the lineage is not clearly conceived as a descent group. The clan, which includes a number of lineages, is the only such group which is distinct in native thought. Lineages have no names. They are designated by the names of the homesteads they occupy. Thus they are not distinguished from extended families, although they differ from these in two respects: first, by including the dead; and second, by excluding husbands related only by marriage.

Nor was any name found for 'lineage' in general, to correspond to kailang for clan. The nearest I came to such a term was in a phrase expressing the preferred type of adoption, which is within the lineage: vam a li nibwogot. Vam means adoption or, with a possessive form, adopted child. A li are, as nearly as our grammatical terms can describe them, a preposition and definite article, which can be translated here as 'according-to-the-'. Ni is another preposition, 'in' or 'within'. Bwogot, usually followed by a possessive suffix, is the name for most of the real property inherited within a lineage. It includes the homestead, one or more separate tracts of coconut land (Tom usually translated it 'coconut land'); also, if I understand it rightly, any breadfruit groves not on the homestead; but not the tracts of hereditary taro swamp (bwēl), although these are inherited in the same way. The English word which comes nearest to translating bwogot (though too broad) is 'estate.' So the phrase vam a li nibwogot can be clumsily translated 'adoption according to the within-the-estate (plan).' This labored

attempt at translation seems worth while in order to show that native thought is focussed on the property, and uses it, perhaps unawares, as a symbol for the lineage within which the property is inherited."

I: Burrows--97-98 (1947-48) Woleaians
116, 613, 423 Ifalik

"Although 'lineage' is an abstraction made by the ethnographer and not, at least explicitly, by the people themselves, adoption is only one of several ways in which it affects individual lives. The most important, because it governs the main source of subsistence, is inheritance of homesteads and food-producing land. In the realm of government, although chiefly titles are talked of as attributes of the clan, they are actually held within the lineage. Only the members of the clan's senior lineage are eligible to the succession. And in the realm of religion, ghosts of ancestors associated with homesteads--that is, in effect, with lineages--are among the supernatural beings most likely to affect [98] the lives of the living."

1: Burrows--105 (1947-48) Woleaians / 2
116, 423, 471 Ifalik

"Most of what we would call public property is called in Ifalik the property of the chiefs. One example is the main roads or paths of the two islands; one running along the lagoon side of Falārik between the houses and the shore; the other a 'belt line' around Falārik close to the taro swamp. Another example is the big seines kept in the canoe-houses. The men's house and the plot of land around it, including the overgrown site of the former men's house--all regarded as a unit and called by the one name Katēlū--is also considered property of the chiefs. In this case the ascription to them has additional force, for one of the functions of Katēlū is to symbolize chiefly dignity and authority.

This concept, ownership by the chiefs of property not used by them more than by everybody else, suggests at first glance the feudalism of medieval Europe. But the resemblance is superficial. While ostensibly the chiefs can do as they please with this property, actually what they please to do is limited by tradition. It never has occurred to them to allot exclusive use of the road or seines to favored retainers, in return for services like the military services of feudal Europe. The former use of the men's house as a dormitory for unmarried youths, and the fairly definite tasks assigned to them, look more like services owed the chiefs in return for use of the chiefs' property. But the natives apparently did not think of the young men's work as room rent; at least the youths still perform definite tasks--so far as we know, the same as before--now

that they no longer sleep in the men's house. Nor have the chiefs ever thought of selling or trading these properties of theirs, or reserving them for their own exclusive use. Such uses of the properties seem inconceivable to them; hence, for all practical purposes, might as well be forbidden.

There is no telling what may happen in the future, as the influence of a foreign concept of property grows stronger. However, one other likely result of increasing foreign influence would be waning power of the chiefs. That would tend to counteract any inclination toward tyrannical disposal of property. But the outcome of such a pull between opposed tendencies, as complicated by an indefinite number of other pulls, is impossible to predict.

Meanwhile, what the chiefs do with such property is virtually the same as what our government officials do with property entrusted to their charge. Both issue orders controlling the use and upkeep of the property for the common benefit. For instance, fishing with the big seines, and repairing or replacing them, are done only on order of the chiefs. But fish caught with the seines are distributed among all the households whose men have done the fishing. If there are enough fish to go further, some will be sent to other districts. And when all districts take part in the fishing, the catch is distributed among the whole population."

1: Burrows--106 (1947-48) Woleaians 1-2
116, 423, 343 Ifalik

"Canoe-houses are in effect public property, or at least property of the men of the neighborhood, most of the time. Yet nominally each one belongs to one or two individuals, and occasionally one is used as private property. They shelter all the sailing canoes and larger paddling canoes whose owners live nearby, and some of the little single-seat rosemāni. (The rest of the rosemāni are either left on the beach or kept in little sheds, erected usually on the shoreward end of the owner's homestead land.) Canoe-houses are also used as club-houses by the men and boys (especially taremwanni, older boys) of the neighborhood, who spend there most of their daytime leisure--and they have plenty of it. They are used, too, for the men's lighter work, not only rope-making, but the making of nets and traps; and as carpenter shops for building canoes. Finally, they are guest-houses for visitors from other islands, who sleep there and are fed by presents from chiefs or relatives.

The canoe-houses from north to south, with their owners as given by Tom, are as follows:

1. Pa'ugop -Totogoeiti (Tom) and Arovalimen
2. Gajuteling -Ilegemwār
3. Fan nï wā -Totogoeiti
4. Sabwōlap -Gabwileisei
5. Fale Pëngā -Fagaulīr
6. Katēlū -north side, Maroligar and Totogoeiti

south side, Toromānn
7. Fan ni Wong -WolpaitIk
8. Pa'auēl -Wolpetau
9. Gavilea -WolpaitIk and Wolpetau

In this list Tom allotted to himself, under his native name Totogoeiti, ownership of two and a quarter canoe-houses, while his nearest rivals, the chiefs Wolpetau and WolpaitIk, have only one and one-half each. This may reflect his insatiable thirst for glory. Particularly suspect is his claim to a share with Maroligar in the north side of the canoe house at Katēlū. This is next to the men's house, shares the same name and, in lesser degree, the same chiefly eminence. It was used by the chiefs during our stay for meeting among themselves, though not for public assemblies. Tom is of the same lineage as Maroligar, and claims to be heir-apparent to his chieftainship; a rather tenuous claim, as he is older than Maroligar, though his junior genealogically. By an unfortunate oversight, I failed to check this list by getting one from somebody else. However, there is no reason to question the pattern of nominal ownership by one or two men."

1: Burrows--106-107 (1947-48) Woleaians 1-2
116, 423, 343 Ifalik

"Through most of our stay, Tom was using one of the canoe-houses he called his own, Fan ni wā, as a workshop for building his sailing canoe. For a time his son used the other, Pa'ugop, for building a small canoe. Other canoes were sheltered in both houses at the same time, but only on the busiest working days did the work interfere with the usual neighborhood meetings. [107]

We saw only one other instance of private use of a canoe-house. For a time the seaward side of one of them, Fale Pëngā, was temporarily walled in, and the family of the owner slept there. This was not during the last part of the west-wind season, a time of heavy rain, occasional strong wind, and constant danger of hurricane, when a man might well want the more substantial shelter of the canoe-house. It was during the trade-wind season, when there was no need for better than ordinary shelter. If the trouble had been a leaky roof, it could have been rethatched in half a day. That was not done during the brief residence of the owner in the canoe-house. To the question 'Why?', the answer was simply that he and his family thought they would like to sleep there for a while. After a week or so they moved out again. This instance shows that the claim to ownership is more than nominal. But it is rarely exercised. Ordinarily the only requirements for constant use of a canoe-house are residence in the neighborhood, and masculinity. Women hardly ever enter a canoe-house: rarely even pass in front of one. (We were told one story--submitted as true, but remembered because it was considered funny--of illegal sexual relationships between an Ifalik man and a Mogmog woman, on a platform

over the tie-beams of a canoe-house in Mogmog. But this account of behavior abroad--behavior as improper as it would be with us--is hardly an exception to the rule that Ifalik women keep out of canoe-houses.)"

1: Burrows-107 (1947-48) Woleaians 1-2
116, 343, 423, 643 Ifalik

"The two southernmost canoe-houses on Falārik island, Fan ni Wong and Pa'ugop, were not in daily use for light work and loafing, like all the others. Pa'ugop, on the channel between the two islands, was indeed busy and populous on special occasions, as when the population of Falārik island was crossing to Falālap for a religious ceremony. At least twice during our stay feasts were held beside this house; once to celebrate the conclusion of a thatching job, once--as I recall it--to partake of an especially good haul of fish which Rauau and Falālap men both had a hand in catching. But on ordinary days it was deserted, or nearly so. More frequently occupied was a small building beside it which served as a workshop, especially for the women of the nearest household, that of chief Toromānn. The next canoe-house to the north, Fan ni Wong, was still less used. Most of the time there was no-one in it, and I never saw more than one or two there except when the men of the adjacent household, Uelepī, gathered there for some common task.

These two canoe-houses adjoined, on opposite sides, the homestead Uelepī, which as the traditional homestead of the senior lineage of the clan Kovalū was the highest-ranking dwelling site on the atoll, and was tabu to outsiders. The butchering of turtle, reserved to Kovalū, was done in a little grove between Uelepī and Fan ni Wong, but nearer to the canoe-house than the dwellings. The question arises whether the aura of rank and sanctity from Uelepī extended to the two canoe-houses, and made men feel less free to use them. This is possible; but in telling us of the tabu on Uelepī, Tom

said nothing of its extending to the canoe-houses. The nominal 'owner' of Fan ni Wong was WolpaitIk, a chief but not of Kovalū clan. (He lived at Uelepī by virtue of marriage to a Kovalū woman.) The owner of Pa'ugop was Wolpetau, highest ranking chief, of Kovalū clan and Uelepī lineage. But this site, though not the canoe-house itself, was most frequented by the household of the lesser chief Toromānn, of Rapevelū clan. On the whole, it seems most likely that the reason for these canoe-houses being less frequented than the others was simply that there were few dwellings nearby. In addition, Fan ni Wong was off the main road; and, because currents had been building a sandy point to seaward of it, was farther from water than any other canoe-house."

1: Burrows--107-108 (1947-48) Woleaians 1.2
116, 423, 501, 643 Ifalik

"Canoes have individual owners. The degree of exclusiveness in their use varies inversely with the size of the canoe. That is, the little rosemani are commonly used rather like private property by the owner and his family for [108] transportation and small-scale fishing. Members of other households do not take out these small canoes without permission. But a larger paddling canoe, still more a sailing canoe, is used most often for fishing by larger parties, usually a district undertaking. Since the owners are usually men of some age, while the fishing is done most often by the youths, the owner of a canoe often does not go out with it on a fishing trip. He has no special claim to the catches made in his canoe. If the chiefs ask his permission to have it taken out, this is more an assignment than a request. He would have difficulty in justifying a refusal, unless the canoe was unseaworthy. In that case it would be his duty to see that it was repaired.

Canoes for sea-burial are similarly assigned. Tom seemed proud to have his new canoe used for the burial of the chief Paliuilimar, who died soon after it was completed. [illegible] canoe house nearest the chief's residence, but was not the only sailing canoe there. The reason Tom gave for using it was 'because it is the biggest.' Both the dead chief and the owner of the canoe were honored. An owner would not undertake an interisland voyage in his canoe without permission of the chiefs, and would take passengers without expecting payment. In sum, the owner of a large canoe, as of a

canoe-house and most other property, is in effect more a custodian than an owner as we think of ownership. Large canoes, like canoe-houses, come very near being public property."

1: Burrows--108 (1947-48) Woleaians / 2
116, 423, 643, 618 Ifalik

"Asked whether there is such a thing as clan property, Tom said there is. The reef and the lagoon, he declared, belong to his clan, SauvelārIk. Members of other clans fish there only on sufferance. Now Tom was always inclined to make the most of any claim to distinction in which he could share, whether the distinction was his own exclusively, or that of his clan, or that of Ifalik as against other islands. I asked him whether other clans had similar claims. He was not sure, and, as usual, referred the question to the chiefs. The first to hand were Maroligar and Toroman. They talked it over, but did not give me an answer. 'Some other chief', Tom explained, 'might say 'This chief, 'e lie'.'

All five chiefs then held a meeting and discussed the question long and vehemently. Then they issued, through Tom, an official answer. No clan, neither SauvelārIk or any other, they declared, has exclusive claim to the use of reef and lagoon. They belong to all the chiefs. Ordinarily it is all right for anyone to use them; but if there is a shortage, as during the time after a hurricane, the chiefs may say 'Only eat a little'; in other words, may ration what food there is.*

"* As this decision was an act of the government, it will be discussed again from that point of view."

This pronouncement did not dispose of the question of clan property other than the reef and lagoon. It was not until later that I learned of the exclusive right of Kovalū clan to turtle, and of SauvelārIk to yellow-fin tuna. These were the only cases found of exclusive claims to property on the part of clans. Actually, these are not instances of ownership in the ordinary sense, but prerogatives of rank; for these two clans hold the highest chiefly titles."

1: Burrows--108-109
116, 592, 423, 613

(1947-48)

Woleaians 1-2
Ifalik

"Homesteads are spoken of as belonging to particular clans. Again the association with rank in the case of Kovalū and SauvelārIk provides the clearest cases. The homestead Uelepī, as just noted, is said to be tabu to all but members of the clan and the husbands of the women--women of the senior lineage of Kovalū--who live there. SauvelārIk has a similar homestead, Tom hastened to assure me--Bwagolei, inland from the men's house, a site no longer inhabited.

In the beginning of our census by households, Tom said that the homestead Ilux, where the highest chief, Wolpetau, lived, 'blong Wolpetau.' [109] He added that it was a homestead of the clan Bwēl. But Wolpetau's clan is Kovalū. In living at Ilux, his wife's ancestral homestead, he follows the custom of matrilocal residence. The homestead 'belongs to him' in the sense that he lives there and, being the senior male, may have the final word, if he cares to, about household activities other than routine.

When we came to the homestead Val i Trel, Tom said 'Blong WolpaitIk', though WolpaitIk lives at Uelepī. This is ownership in another sense. Val i Trel is WolpaitIk's ancestral homestead, but, following the custom of matrilocal residence, he has not lived there since he married. How much interest he takes in the affairs of the household is a matter of choice with him. Any wish of his would be respected, and might well be carried out. But ordinary affairs of this household would only concern him by way of his responsibility for his sister, who lives at Val i Trel. If the sister had sons,

WolpaitIk would have an additional interest on their behalf; but as it happens she is childless.

These cases illustrate a point already made in the discussion of homestead, household, and lineage. Homesteads are occupied and used by households, which are typically extended families; and they are inherited within maternal lineages. For practical purposes that statement covers the question of actual ownership, as distinguished from the imputed ownership by clans or individuals. In other words, title to the homestead is inherited within a group whose existence the natives never explicitly acknowledge--the lineage. Usufruct of it belongs to the household."

1: Burrows--109 (1947-48) Woleaians
116, 423 Ifalik

"All the land on the atoll, except for the road, the sites of the men's house and canoe houses, and the beach between high and low water mark, is divided into tracts, which have names like those of the homesteads. The boundaries of these tracts are supposed to be a matter of common knowledge; at least, those directly concerned seem to have no doubt where they are. Any natural object--most often, apparently, a coconut tree no different from any other--serves as a boundary mark."

1: Burrows--109
116, 423, 613, 241

(1947-48)

Woleaians
Ifalik

"A man will say bwogotai--'my coconut land', as Tom translated it-- either of tracts in which he has inherited a share through his mother, or tracts inherited in his wife's lineage, in which he shares the usufruct by virtue of living on her homestead and gathering coconuts and breadfruit for the household. When Tom said of a bit of coconut land through which we were passing, 'This my land', I asked him if it belonged to him and nobody else. He answered, 'Me and my sister and my sister's boy,' the lineage again. I happen not to have a specific statement referring to land of the wife's lineage, but general discussions of the matter suggest that he might say first 'This my land'; then, if pressed, 'blong my wife and my boy.'

Ownership and inheritance of tracts in the taro swamp conform to the same rule. But in this case they are verbalized differently. Taro patches are spoken of as the property of any of the women who work them, or of their clan. Thus when Tom and his wife Lagajarong took us through the taro swamp so that she might give us a demonstration of weeding and planting, he said of the particular tracts we visited, not 'my land' but 'blong my wife.' He added proudly that she had inherited seven such patches. To my usual follow-up question, he said they were patches belonging to her clan, Mangaulevar. When he pointed out a particularly large stretch as belonging to Wolpetau, I unfortunately failed to follow up the statement; but suspect that this land, or at least some of it, was inherited by Wolpetau's wife as a member of a lineage of Bwël clan.

1: Burrows--109
116, 423, 613, 241

(1947-48)

· Woleaians-2
Ifalik

Members of that clan, traditionally associated with taro culture and now reduced to 11 members, probably have more taro land than they can care for. In this case, probable reasons for naming the chief rather than his wife as owner are his rank and the fact that as a public figure he was well known to me, while his wife was not."

1: Burrows--110
116, 241, 423, 613

(1947-48)

Woleaians
Ifalik

"Certain coconut trees are owned and inherited in a special way. Although the run of the trees in the coconut groves 'go with the land' according to the scheme just described, custom allows any man to ask permission to plant coconuts on another's land. As far as learned, refusal of such a request is unheard-of. But such a planting would never be on a large scale. Only a small, even number of trees--usually two or four--will be planted. Half of them will belong to the owner of the land; more precisely, to his household and eventually his lineage. The other half will belong to the man who planted the nuts. And these will not be inherited according to the usual pattern, within his maternal lineage. They will pass to his son, and so on, patrilineally.

The advantage of this special kind of ownership is convenience. When a man gets thirsty, no matter where he is, he will probably own a coconut tree not far away where he can get a young nut to drink. Coconut trees and the fruit on them are very definitely not public property. Asked whether a man might take a nut from a tree that did not belong to him, Tom said 'very bad that.' Having a tree of your own nearby reduces temptation to steal."

1: Burrows--110 (1947-48) Woleaians
116, 423 Ifalik

"To anyone accustomed to the rigor with which titles are searched and boundaries surveyed in our culture, the Ifalik system of land tenure must seem loose and vague. Yet it works satisfactorily. As long as there are enough coconuts, taro, and-in season-breadfruit to go around, their way of locating boundaries, which they consider exact but which might be open to question if tested closely, causes no difficulties. Presumably it would be quite a different matter if these crops were scarcer, or if foreign influence increased to a point where land was more intensively cultivated (if that is feasible), and productive of more than subsistence. Difficulties would almost certainly arise if the land became desirable to foreigners, and so began to be sold. In such a case the surveys, hearings and disputes that have tormented administrators of many other Pacific islands might be expected. But so long as the poor soil of Ifalik is of no interest to foreigners the native system of land tenure will suffice. We heard of no disputes over ownership of land."

1: Burrows--110
116, 231, 423

(1947-48)

Woleaians
Ifalik

"Domestic animals are, in effect, household property, except that ownership of dogs --or some of them--seems to be more individual. There are perceptible attachments between some dogs and some individual masters. The masters, at least when they are grown men, may feel free to dispose of these dogs without consulting the rest of the household. Tom got his dog in that way, as a gift from a friend on Faraulep. I heard of no gifts of pigs--their scarcity makes that less likely--nor even of chickens, though a cooked chicken may be offered as a gift of food. Ordinarily pigs and chickens are regarded as part of the household supply of food."

1: Burrows--110-111 (1947-48) Woleaians
116, 423, 643, 576 Ifalik

"Tom added that it would be all right for us, since we were foreigners and had no trees of our own, to take nuts from other people's trees. But in practise the chiefs, as our hosts, kept us in drinking nuts, getting them from their own trees. Usually that meant from trees on land belonging to their lineage; but some nuts were given us from trees on Katēlū, nominally chiefs' property. And at least once we were regaled from a tree owned in the other way. After a stint of census-taking, I asked for a nut to drink. Wolpetau, who was with us during the first part of the census, assumed the obligation to provide drinking nuts for the two of us, because of his rank. (If he had not been present, the head of the household would have had them brought to us,) Wolpetau directed a boy to a particular tree near by, which belonged to him. [111]

In discussing this, Tom said there were other men who owned more trees than Wolpetau. Could Wolpetau, as highest-ranking chief, commandeer nuts or trees belong to another? Yes, Tom answered; if Wolpetau wanted some, 'no can keep 'im.' When the same question came up in another connection, though, Tom denied any such right. Pretty surely the question is 'academic'. Though such a right would often be accorded a chief in discussing the extent of his authority, a chief would never think of exercising it, unless perhaps, in an emergency, for public use."

2: Damm et al. --81 [2] (1909) 1938 Woleaians
116, 423, 592 Ifaluk

Land and soil do not belong to an individual, but to the family; this also applies to the stand of fruit trees. Even the five bugodăl, which the king possesses, are not his personal property, for he shares them with his brothers and sisters. The taro fields belong to the female, the coconut palm stands to the male members of the family. When a man marries, he brings his wife the usufruct of the property of his family. There is a mutual agreement about whether they shall receive their nourishment from the soil of his or her family. If the woman has any children, the husband gives one or two of his family plots to his wife's family. The amount depends upon his own wealth, and in any case they are never whole pieces of property; generally they consist of a taro field for the girls, and several palms for the boys. Some palm trees are always assigned; a group of them on the border of the property is notched in a particular way with a knife, so that a circular mark is made. This group is not for the children; it becomes the personal property of the mother's family. We can still see how the mother was formerly the central point of the family. A family has between one and seven pieces of property. The boundary lines (nibidăli bŭgod) are shown by trees.

The same regulations apply to the household possessions; the huts belong to the family, and indeed to the whole family.

2: Damm et al. --190 [2] (1909) 1938 Woleaians
116, 423, 562 Faraulep

Together they [KS: men and women] own bananas and bread-fruit trees, while the large canoes and the big canoe-house belong to the village. The chief has to look after the repairs, but the villagers are ready to assist him.

2: Damm et al. --191-192 (1909) 1938 Woleaians
116, 423, 565 Faraulep

Real estate is divided between the two class groups: the high chief had 24 plots, in addition to Ead and Pix Islands [192] (at times he put tabus on these properties so that no one might go there), the poirim had 17 lots, the aûelig 20, and the mánu 13. They let the villagers till their possessions, and pay for the labor with coconuts.

3: Thilenius and Hellwig--255 (1909-10) 1927 Woleaians
116, 423, 565 Woleai

The counting of the palm-trees... revealed that there were 9480 palms on the island (several hundred very young palm trees and seedlings had not been counted). The three chiefs owned 3430 big palm trees; 5 "minor chiefs" own 3600 pieces; 40 pieces were the property of the unmarried sister of a man from Watoai who though he is living here does not own a single palm tree; he is, however, married abroad. According to the rule of inheritance, palm trees as well as landed property of men who had died without sons or brothers are said to become the property of the chiefs of those who had died. Evidently, however, women, too, could become heirs to their husbands; for each one of 2 widows owned 300 and 850 palms respectively.

3: Thilenius and Hellwig--259 (1909-10) 1927 Woleaians
116, 784, 423 Faraulep

A taboo-sign which had been posted by the owner of the island [LEM: of Eat], the chief Sâuerū, debarred the inhabitants of the sister-islands from entering Eat; at certain times only they were permitted to collect there coconuts, turtle-eggs, or tobacco-leaves.

4: Krämer--29 (1909) 1937 Woleaians
116, 343, 423 Lamotrek

The Canoehouses and their owners are:

fal	Owner	House
a) Faletaipu, former lot of the chief on which no one was to transgress.	Sukurang and Selābo	24a
b) Aboi (also called Eaboi and Ieloi) plate 1b and 9c, ill 53.	Bóesu	4
c) Lúgal plate 1b.	Lólit	5
d) Kulong	Faragaus	1
e) Falemara	Sukúlubo	14
f) Gatia rákēs "near the calophyllum"	Meisor	24a
g) Vorič tag or Boerieitug	Urupo	10
h) Gauárag (also called Gauosag) "spot of grudge"	Ikeséra	25
i) Falemareg		
k) [sic] Uélibugui or Uōle		30

4: Krämer--31 (1909) 1937 Woleaians
116, 423 Elato

awŭăr cucumber tree. They are common property and the fruit is distributed to the various houses.

28: Spiro--42 [6] (1947-48) 1949 Woleaians
116, 437, 423 Ifalik

"The only commercial transaction involves the acquisition of some raw material, and this is rare. I observed only one such transaction during our entire stay on the atoll. I was sitting with Tom and two other men in a canoe house in Felarik, when a canoe paddled by men from Falalap came up. The men beached their canoe, and then sat on the beach, conversing among themselves. Tom asked them what they were doing there. They said that they had come to acquire a certain tree, which they wanted to make a canoe. Tom told them who the owner of the tree was and some of them went to call him. In the meantime the others unloaded a number of blankets and coils of rope, which was the payment for the tree. There was no bargaining or discussion, the Falalap men giving what they thought the tree was worth, and the owner accepting the payment without question. He neither examined nor counted their payment, nor did he attempt to keep the tree. Later, I asked Tom whether the exchange was fair, and he said that the payment was very generous."

28: Spiro--43
116, 423

(1947-48) 1949

Woleaians
Ifalik

"Free Property: All the uncultivated land in the bush is free property, and can be used by any one, tresspass not being recognized."

28: Spiro--43 [2] (1947-48) 1949 Woleaians
116, 423, 226 Ifalik

"Public property: This includes the seins, fighting traps, canoe-houses, and the Fanap. The seins and fishing traps are constructed by the men of a district, and remain in the canoe-houses. They are communal property, and are used by the men in their fishing expeditions. The Fanap is the 'town-hall', and though it is said that is 'belongs to the chiefs', it is actually used for all public meetings, and is repaired, in case of damage, by all the men of the district. The canoe houses, are theoretically owned by one individual, in that one of his ancestors is reputed to have built it. But, actually it is used by all the men, of the district, and is repaired by them. Any attempt on his part to prevent some one from using it would be unthinkable."

28: Spiro--43 [3] (1947-48) 1949 Woleaians
116, 423, 613 Ifalik

"Lineage property: The houses and taro patches are included in this category. Theoretically the house is owned by the eldest woman of the lineage, and at her death is inherited by the next oldest woman. This is just another way of saying, however, that it belongs to the matrilineal lineage, for it descends in that line in perpetuity. This means that the house in non-transferable, that it can not be bought or sold. Theoretically, the taro patches are owned by the men, but again analysis reveals that it is lineage property. The women of the man's household work his patch, the taro belongs to them, and they use it to feed the members of their household, including their husbands who are members of a different lineage. However, a woman gives some of the prepared taro to her brother indicating that it belongs to all the members of the lineage. That the taro patches belong to the lineage is also revealed by the fact that they descend to the man's sister's sons at his death."

28: Spiro--43 [4]
116, 423, 613

(1947-48) 1949

Woleaians
Ifalik

"Patrilineal group property: Coconut and breadfruit trees are owned by the males of a patrilineal descent group, so that a man's death, his trees descend to his son's and brother's sons, and like the taro-patches and houses, belong to this line perpetuity, being non-transferable."

41: Bates & Abbott N-5 (1953) 1958
OR21 Woleai OR21
Ifáluk

We picked up that word "boondock" in Guam, and very useful it proved to be. It became an important part of the Abbott-Bates vocabulary, and may well have also infected the Ifalukian speech. In Guam, it was used to refer to the wild tangle of miscellaneous vegetation that had taken over so much of the island after the disruption of the war.

The boondocks on Ifaluk were the parts of the atoll that were not clearly something else—that is, not coconut grove, not taro swamp, not household area. The boondocks were not exactly wild, because all sorts of useful things grew there, including planted coconuts and breadfruit trees. They were not exactly cultivated either. Such areas could thus hardly be called "jungle" or "scrub"; and "forest" seemed rather inappropriate. "Boondock" was just the word; though we could perhaps better have used the Ifalukian equivalent, niwel.

The boundary between the coconut grove and the boondocks was sharply defined: weeds and shrubs were kept cleared out of the coconuts only up to this definite line—the boondock line. This again roughly paralleled the lagoon shore, fifty or sixty yards in. We plotted it on our map, later, when the trail mapping seemed fairly well in hand.

The habitations, deep in the coconut grove and near the boondock line, were grouped into "households." The census showed that there were twenty-six such households on the atoll, eleven on the island of Falalap, and fifteen on Falarik. The Falarik households were not scattered evenly along the highway and lagoon, but formed two clusters or villages, one called Rauau, at the south end of the island—the Fan Nap was in the middle of this—and the other called "Falarik" (the address would probably be "Falarik, Falarik") with a gap of about a quarter of a mile along the broad highway between the two.

The whole system of land ownership of the island was built around these households, each of which had a name. Later in the summer we tried to map the holdings of one household, Falepenach. These holdings included not only the immediate vicinity of the living quarters, but also several patches of boondock and coconut grove on Falarik, and patches in the big taro swamp on Falalap. The patch arrangement seemed to provide that each household would "own" its share of each of the different kinds of land.

The households varied greatly in size, from one which included

41: Bates & Abbott N-5 (1953) 1958
OR21 Woleai OR21
Ifaluk

are "natural" and to what extent man-made, because they have been subject to careful cultivation for many generations. The care of the gardens is exclusively women's work and they become expert gardeners. The plants are set in neat rows in rectangular patches, each patch belonging to a particular household so that each household on the atoll has its share of the large Falalap gardens. Weeds grow luxuriously in the rich, mucky soil, and weeding is the main gardening chore. The weeds, I was interested to see, are always buried in the muck, so the practice of "green manuring" is an ancient one here. With young plants, coconut leaves were sometimes used as mulch, to cut down the growth of weeds.

I was greatly impressed, watching these women go about their work, at how little a Westerner would be able to tell them about gardening practices, at how well their methods were adapted to the plants and environment of their atoll. Perhaps one could put this another way, and wonder at how little modern "civilized" man with all his science has been able to improve on, or change, the gardening practices developed by peasant cultures through generations living close to the earth. We have made drastic changes in large-scale agriculture, but the gardener, throughout the world, shares a curiously large fund of common lore.

But I had intended to write here about food, not about agricultural methods. Wot and pulach were eaten to some extent, even during the breadfruit season, just as the preserved breadfruit (mar) was eaten to some extent at other times of the year, making some variation in the daily monotony of starch. There were many slightly different ways of cooking these tubers. We liked best a way of preparing wot (*Colocasia*) whereby it was mashed, cooked with coconut cream, moulded into little balls in a pot, and the whole covered with a thick paste of coconut meat. The effect was a little like that of mashed sweet potatoes served with heavy whipped cream.

Coconut, of course, permeated every aspect of Ifalukian cooking—the milk from green nuts and ripe nuts, the flesh from green nuts and ripe nuts, the sap from the cut flower stalks (here called hachi, perhaps best called "toddy" in English). The coconut was more often used as a supplement in cooking breadfruit or taro, as a seasoning, or the